

PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES IV<sup>1</sup>  
ELEVEN PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random collection of words which are either omitted from PED,<sup>2</sup> or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there.

1. *akkhi(n)* 'gambler'

2. *ajjhābhava* 'losing throw'

Lüders dealt at length with the playing of dice in ancient India.<sup>3</sup> He did not mention what appears to be a reference to dice-playing at Ja II 357,6\*:

*yena mittena saṃsaggā yogakkhemo vihiṃsati*<sup>4</sup>

*pubbe v' ajjhābhavan tassa rakkhe akkhiva paṇḍito.*

Rouse translated: 'What time the nearness of a bosom friend threatens your peace to end, if you are wise, guard your supremacy like the apple of your eye'.<sup>5</sup> It is, however, clear that this cannot be correct. It is 'his supremacy' (*tassa ajjhābhavaṃ*), as the commentator makes clear: *tassa pāpamittassa ajjhābhavaṃ* (357,15'). Here, then, the root *rakkh-* has the meaning not of 'guard' in the sense of 'protect', but of 'ward off, guard against', as in *manopadosaṃ rakkheyya* 'one should ward off fault(s) of the mind'<sup>6</sup> (Sn 702).

This being so, the sense is not appropriate if we take *ajjhābhavaṃ* as parallel to *akkhī*. It might be suggested that the author of the verse is taking the second element of the comparison in the more usual sense of *rakkh-*, giving the two different senses in close proximity: 'guard against an evil friend as you guard your eyes', but this would seem to imply a degree of maladroitness on the author's part. The commentator does not help greatly, except that *ajjhābhavaṃ* is explained as *tena abhibhavitabbaṃ*,<sup>7</sup> i.e. it is assumed that there is little difference between the verbs *adhy-ā-bhū-* and *abhi-bhū-*.

I would suggest that the answer to the problem lies in the realisation that *rakkhe* has the same meaning in both parts of the comparison, and the parallel is between the *paṇḍita* who

must ward off the *ajjhābhava* of a bad friend, and the *akkhī* who must also ward off *ajjhābhava*. If, following the commentator, we equate the verbs *adhy-ā-bhū-* and *abhi-bhū-*, and remember that *abhibhū* is the name of a throw at dice, then we see the possibility of deriving *akkhī* from \**akṣi(n)* 'one who possesses dice, a gambler'. According to Lüders, *abhibhū* equals *kali* 'the losing throw'.<sup>8</sup> This gives an insight into the way in which the throws were regarded. 'The losing throw' (as we would see it) is the throw which makes you the loser, i.e. the throw which defeats you, overcomes you (= *abhibhū* 'conqueror'). If we assume that *ajjhābhava* has the same meaning as *abhibhū*, then the verse gives the meaning 'one should ward off the losing throw'.<sup>9</sup> For the non-gambling sense, there must be some meaning closer to the original one, such as 'onslaught, state of being superior'.

### 3. *anugīyanti* 'they are recited'

This word appears in the (interpolated)<sup>10</sup> rubric *tattha sikkhānugīyanti* at Sn 940. There are three v.11. listed in the Ee of Sn:<sup>11</sup> *-kriyanti*, *-griyanti* and *-grīyanti*, all from Burmese MSS.<sup>12</sup> The phrase *sikkhānugīyanti* is also quoted at Sadd 923,21 in the form *sikkhā na grīyanti* as an example of a word including *-r-*, which is appropriate to the *Māgadhiḥkā bhāsā*.<sup>13</sup>

In an examination of consonant groups containing *-r-* in Pāli, von Hinüber has suggested<sup>14</sup> that this form with *-r-* arose from a miswriting of the word *anugīyanti* as *anagūyanti*, by metathesis of the *u-mātrā*. The akṣara *gu* was then misinterpreted as *gra*, and von Hinüber gives other examples of this type of misinterpretation in an older form of the Sinhalese script.<sup>15</sup> The resultant form was then written as *anagrīyanti*. A variant of this appears in a Sinhalese MS of Nidd I (see below) as *anagriyanti*.<sup>16</sup> The restoration of the preverb *anu-* led to the form *anugrīyanti*.<sup>17</sup> This explanation has the merit that it explains how the reading *sikkhā na grīyanti* in Sadd came into being, but even so I cannot accept it. It would seem impossible that a scribe could metathesise the akṣaras *nu gī* into *na guī*, because the need to write an initial *ī-* in the middle of a word would have made it clear to

him that he was making a mistake. Such an explanation shows the dangers of working out possible sound changes in the Roman script, where a metathesis of this kind does not seem unreasonable.

I should rather propose an explanation on the following lines. It seems that the passive verb *anugīy-* is very rare in Pāli,<sup>18</sup> and it perhaps happened that a 'Sanskritising' scribe thought that it was to be derived from the root *gr-* rather than from *gā-*. He accordingly 'Sanskritised' it to *-grīy-*. Part of the scribal tradition changed this to *-griy-* because of the analogy with *-kriy-*, etc., while another part of the tradition did not recognise *-grīy-*, and actually replaced it by *-kriy-*. If I do not accept von Hinüber's explanation, then I have to explain the way in which the reading quoted in Sadd came into being. It seems possible that if the passive verb *anugīy-* was not common in Pāli, then the scribal tradition might have taken the received phrase *sikkhānugīyanti* and divided it as *sikkhā nu gīyanti*. In this context *nu* gave the sense of a question 'are they recited?'. This was replaced by *na*, giving the sense of a negative question 'are they not recited?'.

The v.11. are as follows (besides the v.11. quoted from Ee of Sn above): In the quotation of Sn 940 at Nidd I 420,7, Ee quotes no v.1., but in the lemma at 420,12 and again at 420,23 there is the v.1. *sikkhānagriyanti* from Sinhalese MS S. At Nidd I 432,15 we find *sikkhānugīyanti*, without v.1. There is no hint of either *na* or *nu* in the exegesis in Nidd I, but the lemma is *gīyanti*,<sup>19</sup> not *anugīyanti*. There is, however, a v.1. for the first of the explanatory forms: *nigīyanti* for *gīyanti*, which perhaps indicates a tradition which, faced with the form *sikkhānugīyanti*, interpreted it as *sikkhā nigīyanti*. Nidd-a I 432,18–19 (without v.1) explains: *sikkhā kathīyanti uggayhanti*, which seems to be following Pj II 567,12 (also without v.1.): *aneka-sikkhā kathīyanti uggayhanti vā*. Both texts give *sikkhānugīyanti* in the lemma, without v.1.

### 4. *anuvicca* 'having discerned'

As Brough pointed out,<sup>20</sup> there has been a strong reluctance to accept the view of some Pāli commentators that *anuvicca* is to be derived from the verb *anu-vid-*, e.g. at Sn

530, in a context with the word *anuvidito*, where Pj II 431,13 explains: *anu-viditvā*. Brough pointed out that in Gāndhārī Dharmapada 241 *aṇu'ija* occurs where Pāli Dhp 229 has *anuvicca*, glossed as *jānitvā* at Dhp-a III 329,7. By assigning *anuvicca* to the group of 'hyper-Palisms' exemplified by such words as *pāceti* (< *pra-aj-*) and *manta* (< *manda*), he postulated a parallelism between the Pāli and the Gāndhārī words, although he also hinted<sup>21</sup> at a belief that a connection might have been seen with \**anu-vicya*, on the analogy with *vi-vicya* 'having discerned'.

The parallelism is not, however, as close as Brough suggested. Although hyper-Palisms are not rare, in which a voiced consonant seems to have been interpreted as being a loan from a dialect which voiced unvoiced consonants, and was therefore unvoiced, this only happens in circumstances where voicing happens as a normal rule. The voicing of geminate consonants is very rare, and as a rule seems only to happen in the case of *-ṭṭ-/ṭṭh-* > *-ḍḍ-/ḍḍh-*,<sup>22</sup> and perhaps *-kkh-* > *-ggh-*.<sup>23</sup> I know of no example of *-cc-* being voiced to *-jj-*, and if this is so, then there was no reason why a scribe finding a word containing *-jj-* in his exemplar should have thought that it was voiced from *-cc-*, and should consequently have wished to "restore" it to its "original" form. This would in any case seem extremely inappropriate in respect of the word \**anuvijja*, which should have been immediately recognisable.

If we reject *anu-vidya* as the etymology, we are left with the other suggestions which have been made. Some depend upon haplogy: \**anuvicicca* (perhaps through *anuviiicca*?) or *anuvivicca*. More straightforward would be \**anuvicya*, as Brough suggested, or a derivation from the verb *anu-i-*. Brough, however, doubted the latter, on the grounds that the recorded senses of *anveti* did not fit the verse.<sup>24</sup> Monier-Williams gives 'reached by the mind, understood' as meanings for the past participle *anv-ita*,<sup>25</sup> and if these could be accepted for the other verbal forms then a derivation from *anu-i-* would seem to be satisfactory. We could then postulate a form \**anuv-itya* with a svarabhakti vowel, or if we saw a derivation from *anu-vi-i-* (which exists in Sanskrit,

but with a different meaning)<sup>26</sup> we could postulate \**anu-vi-itya* > *anu-vīya* > *anuvicca*. The past participle would be *anu-vi-ita* > *anu-vīta*, or possibly *anu-vi-y-ita*, with a sandhi *-y-*.<sup>27</sup> It could well be that *anu-vidita* is a hyper-form derived from *anu-vi-y-ita*.

It would seem likely that *anuvicca* is to be connected with the Ardha-Māgadhī words *aṇuvī*, *aṇuvī*, *aṇuvīti* and *aṇuvītiya*.<sup>28</sup> These are alleged to be derived from *anuvicint-*,<sup>29</sup> but this would seem to be impossible, as Schubring stated.<sup>30</sup> He derived them from *anuvici-*, and took *aṇuvī(ya)* as being for \**anuviciya*. Pischel quotes<sup>31</sup> also *anucintya* and *vicārya* from the scholiasts, but rejects the idea that we are dealing with an absolutive. He suggests that *aṇuvī* is an adverb, to be derived from \**anuvīti*, with the meaning 'deeply, etc.'. On the other hand, if we assume that *aṇuvi(t)iya* is derived from a svarabhakti form of \**anuvitya*, which is a svarabhakti form of *anvitya*, then a derivation from *anveti* would be possible for both the Pāli and the Ardha-Māgadhī forms.

It would then seem probable that the Gāndhārī redactor did not recognise the word (presumably *anuvicca*) which he received in his exemplar. He assumed that it was to be derived from the same verb as the word *anuviditvā* by which it was sometimes explained in the commentarial tradition, and therefore replaced *anuvicca* by *aṇu'ija* from *anuvidya*.

#### 5. *gotra-bhū* 'supporting or destroying the religious family'

PED suggests that the etymology for this word is: *gotr* = *gotṛ*, Skt *gotṛ* to *gup* + *bhū*. The translation given by PED is, however, 'become of the lineage'. Brough pointed out<sup>32</sup> the inconsistency of this etymology and translation. He noted that if the etymology were correct, a *gotra-bhū* would be one who had come under the protection of the Buddha. This explanation is, however, not free from difficulties. Whatever the etymology, there is no doubt that the word *gotra* in Pāli quickly acquired the sense of Skt *gotra*, and *gotra-bhū* seems to have been used in the sense of one who had become a member of the Buddhist community, one who had become converted to Buddhism, but had not yet 'entered on the stream'.

In a very detailed investigation of the word, Ruegg decided<sup>33</sup> that *gotra* meant 'spiritual lineage', and he seemed to accept that *-bhū* was from the root *bhū-*, since he was content to translate the compound as '(one) having the state of the lineage'. At a later date von Hinüber<sup>34</sup> and Wijesekera<sup>35</sup> published, almost simultaneously, parallel suggestions that *gotra-bhū* was to be derived from *gotra-han*, translating 'das Geschlecht vernichtend'<sup>36</sup> and 'one who discards his worldly (lit. clan) status'<sup>37</sup> respectively. This suggestion for the etymology was based upon the development of *bhūnahu* from *bhrūṇahan*,<sup>38</sup> and *vatrabhū* from *vṛtrahan*, as Fausbøll suggested long ago.<sup>39</sup> Ruegg has re-examined<sup>40</sup> the matter in the light of this suggestion, and has pointed out that the proposed meaning, while not inappropriate for the use of the word in most contexts, does not seem to solve all the problems of its usage.

One problem is that, although for the most part the word is used in a good sense, in one context in the Pāli canon it is used in a bad sense. This leads to the need to decide upon the meaning of *gotra*. Is it the secular family which one leaves in order to become a Buddhist? In this sense to be a *gotra-bhū* would be good. Can it be the religious family which one joins when one becomes a Buddhist? In this sense to be a *gotra-bhū* would be a bad thing. It is possible that the two senses of *gotra* gave rise to the usage of the word *gotra-bhū* in both a good and a bad sense.

Ruegg, however, has given sufficient evidence<sup>41</sup> to show that at a later time, at least, *gotra* is used in the religious sense. If we could take this as certain, then it would be possible to explain the two different usages of *gotra-bhū* as being due to the fact that we are dealing with two quite different words. One, that used in a bad sense, is the word which has the meaning 'the destroyer of the religious family'. The other could be based upon the root *bhū-*, but I should prefer to follow another etymology, which is rejected by von Hinüber<sup>42</sup> in favour of the one he adopts. In the next section of this article I shall be dealing with the word *pāṇa-bhū* < *prāṇa-bhṛt*, and I suggest that the favourable sense of *gotra-bhū* is based upon a development from *gotra-bhṛt* 'supporting

the (religious) family'. Although von Hinüber mentions *gotra-bhṛt*,<sup>43</sup> he does so only as a variant for *gotra-bhid*.

If this suggestion is correct, there were at an earlier stage of the language two separate words: *gotra-han* 'destroying the family' and *gotra-bhṛt* 'supporting the family'. The former developed into *gotra-ha* and then *gotra-hu*, with the change of *-a* to *-u* found in several monosyllabic words in Pāli, e.g. *kataññu* < *kṛtajña* and *pāragu* < *pāraga*, and the latter into *gotra-bhū*. The alternation *bh/h*, found so commonly in *bhavati/hotī*, then led to the change of the former to *gotra-bhū*, which was identical with the latter.

Ruegg points out<sup>44</sup> that in BHS *gotrabhū* seems to refer to a place (= *gotra-bhūmi*). It is possible that the same meaning is to be seen in the Pāli compounds *āgotrabhum* and *āgotrabhūto*<sup>45</sup> (= the ablative in *-to*). If this is so, then these two words are not connected with either of the *gotra-bhū* words I have been discussing.

#### 6. *pāṇabhū*, *pāṇabhūta* 'a living creature'

PED lists both these words, but does not give an etymology for them. Helmer Smith gave<sup>46</sup> the etymology of the first as *prāṇa-bhṛt* 'bearing life'. When this word occurs as *pāṇa-bhuno*, in agreement with *sabbesaṃ* (i.e. as a genitive plural) at Ja IV 494,27\*, it is explained by the commentator as *pāṇa-bhūtānaṃ* (498,6'). This explanation seems to be based upon a belief that the second part of the compound is from the root *bhū-*, i.e. 'being a living creature'.

The word *pāṇa-bhūta* itself occurs at Sn 146: *ye keci pāṇabhūt' atthi*, where Pj I 245,11 explains: *pāṇā eva bhūtā pāṇabhūtā*. It was suggested by von Hinüber<sup>47</sup> that an Eastern form *-bhune* underlies *-bhūtā*, but a simpler explanation is to assume that there were two developments of *-bhṛt* in MIA: one showing the loss of the final *-t* and the change of *-ṛ-* > *-u-*, i.e. *-bhu*, and the other showing the addition of a thematic *-a* to the consonant, i.e. *-bhuta*. The same alternative development is to be seen in MIA *dhanu* and *dhanuha* (< \**dhanusa*) from *dhanuṣ*. The change of *-bhuta* to *-bhūta* was perhaps due to the belief that *pāṇa-bhū* contained the root *bhū-* (as noted above). It is also possible that the form

represents the generalisation of a spelling which arose for metrical reasons. There is a v.l. *-bhut'* at Sn 146, but the correct reading there must be *-bhūt'*, since this is confirmed by the metre, which is old āryā/gīti.<sup>48</sup>

The reading of Ee at Ap 152,4 can hardly be correct: *pāṇabhūtaṃ bhayaṃ n' atthi*. There is no v.l. listed in Ee. Be and Ce 1961<sup>49</sup> read *-bhūte*; Ce 1930<sup>50</sup> reads *-bhūnaṃ*, which seems more satisfactory as representing the genitive plural ending of a stem in *-u* derived < *-r(t)*. The genitive plural *-bhuno* at Ja IV 494,27\* (see above) probably shows the shortening of *-ū-* for metrical reasons. There are other examples of genitive plural forms in *-o*.<sup>51</sup>

#### 7. *rattaññu*<sup>52</sup> 'senior, superior'

This word commonly occurs in contexts with *cira-pabbajita*. It is explained at Sv 143,10–11 (*ad D I 48,2*) as: *pabbajjato paṭṭhāya atikkantā bahū rattiyo jānāti*, and at Pj II 423,32 – 424,2 (*ad Sn p. 92,22*) as: *nibbānaratanam jānāma mayan ti evaṃ sakāya paṭiññāya lokenāpi sammataḥ bahurattividū vā*. This indicates that the commentaries analysed the compound as being from *ratta* (= *ratna* or *rātra*) + *-ññu* (= *-jña*), with *ratna* taken as *nibbāna*, and *rātra* being interpreted as referring to the number of nights (= days) which had elapsed since the bhikkhu's ordination (*rattiyo jānanti ti rattaññū, attano pabbajitadivasato paṭṭhāya pahūtā rattiyo jānanti*, Sp 193,27–29). That the element *-ññu* (whatever its origin) shows the same change of declension from *-a* to *-u* as *-jña* does to *-ññu* is shown by the fact that the plural ending is *-ññā* in a context with *aggaññā* and *vaṃsaññā* at A II 27,16, which is glossed: *rattaññā ti dīgharattam pavattā ti jānitabbā* (Mp III 45,10–11). Sadd 634,1 lists *rattaññu* as optionally taking both *-o* and *-u* as the nominative singular ending.

It seems likely that the interpretations based upon the words *ratna* or *rātra* are the products of folk etymology, although it must be noted that the BHS tradition followed the explanation based upon *rātra*, and produced the back-formation *rātrijña*.<sup>53</sup> I would agree with Mme Caillaud<sup>54</sup> that the word is to be connected with the Ardha-Māgadhī word *rāñiya*, which is to be separated from the homonym *rāñiya*

(< *rājanya*) 'royal, related to a king'. The former is explained as being derived from *\*rātnika*, which seems not to occur in Skt, interpreted as: *ratnāni jñānādini tair ādhikyena caratī ti*, and translated as: 'one who is older in initiation or merits such as knowledge'.<sup>55</sup> PSM gives<sup>56</sup> two meanings: (1) *cāritra vālā, saṃyamī*; (2) *paryāya se jyeṣṭha, sādhotva-prāpti kī avasthā se barā*. Jacobi translates as 'superior',<sup>57</sup> and gives the equivalence *rātnika* = *jyeṣṭha*.<sup>58</sup>

If the origin were *\*rātnika*, then it would not seem possible to derive the Pāli form from it, and I would rather suggest that the origin is *\*rātnya*. With a svarabhakti vowel, this would give *\*rātniya*, from which Jain Skt *rātnika* would be a back-formation. With another svarabhakti vowel we would get *\*rātaniya*, which could develop to *\*rāyaniya* and then, with palatalisation of *-a-* > *-i-* after *-y-*,<sup>59</sup> to *rā(y)iniya*. This would give the Ardha-Māgadhī form *rāñiya*. The Pāli form would be derived from *\*rātnya* with a different svarabhakti vowel, giving *\*rātanya* > *\*rātañña*, and then with the alternation *rāt-/ratt-* seen in the doublet *rātī* < *rātrī* but *ratta* < *rātra*, *\*rātañña* was replaced by *rattañña*. The development of the ending *-a* > *-u* is parallel to *-jña* > *-ññu*. Another example of *-ñña* becoming *-ññu*, although not derived from *-jña*, can be seen in *vadaññu* < Skt *vadānya*,<sup>60</sup> cf. (a)*vadāniya* with a svarabhakti vowel.

The original meaning of *rattaññu* would therefore have been 'possessing jewels', which was then interpreted in a religious sense, probably 'possessing the jewels of the teaching'. A trace of this meaning perhaps lies behind the commentary upon the Buddha's statement that Aññakoṇḍañña was the topmost of the bhikkhus who were *rattaññu* (A I 23,17), just as Mahāpajāpati Gotamā was the topmost of the bhikkhunīs (A I 25,18). The commentary explains in the usual way: *rattaññūnan ti rattiyo jānantānam* (Mp I 135,5 foll.), and goes on to say that, as he was the Buddha's first follower: *cirakālam rattiyo jānāti ti rattaññu sabbapaṭhamam dhammassa paṭividdhattā*.

#### 8. *vāri* 'restraint'

PED lists *vāri* in the sense of 'water' only, and includes

under this heading the four compounds of the word with *-vārita*, *-yuta*, *-dhuta* and *-phuṭa* which are found in a list of Jain practices<sup>61</sup> at D I 57,27–29 (where the word occurs in the form *vāri*-) and M I 377,1–2. The commentaries explain: *sabba-vāri-vārito cā ti vārita-sabba-udako, paṭikkhitta-sabba-sītodako ti attho. so kira sītodake satta-saññī hoti, tasmā taṃ na vaḷañjēti. sabba-vāri-yuto ti sabbena pāpa-vāraṇena yutto. sabba-vāri-dhuto ti sabbena pāpa-vāraṇena dhuta-pāpo. sabba-vāri-phuṭṭho ti sabbena pāpa-vāraṇena phuṭṭho* (Sv 168,1–6 = Ps III 58,22 – 59,3 = Spk I 127,1–8 [ad S I 66,17 ‘*cātu-yāma-saṃvuto*’])). In Ps, but not the other two commentaries, there is an addition at the end of the explanation of the first compound: *atha vā sabba-vāri-vārito ti sabbena pāpa-vāraṇena vārita-pāpo*.

Rhys Davids translated:<sup>62</sup> ‘. . . restrained with a fourfold self-restraint: . . . restrained as regards all water; restrained as regards all evil; all evil has he washed away; and he lives suffused with the sense of evil held at bay’. Miss Horner translated:<sup>63</sup> ‘Controlled by the control of the fourfold watch: he is wholly restrained in regard to water; he is bent on warding off all evil; he has shaken off all evil; he is permeated with the (warding off) of all evil’. Basham too includes<sup>64</sup> a reference to ‘water’ in the first restraint.

It is clear that there are problems in translating in this way, the most important being the fact that it entails taking *vāri* in the first restraint in a different sense from the others, which is doubtless why Ps gives the alternative explanation. Although Franke accepted the difference, and thought there was a deliberate word-play,<sup>65</sup> others have sought translations which avoided the difference. Mrs Rhys Davids stated<sup>66</sup> that all four restrictions applied to the use of water, a special Jain austerity, to avoid injuring the *sattas* or living souls there might be in it. Dalsukh Malvania stated<sup>67</sup> that *vāri* must have the sense of ‘sin’ in each compound, although I do not know his reasons for so saying. Nāṇamoli translated:<sup>68</sup> ‘Curbed by all curbs, clamped by all curbs, cleansed by all curbs, and claimed by all curbs’. It seems to me that this is on the right lines, and since at D I 57,26–27 we find the words *cātu-yāma-*

*saṃvara-saṃvuto* and *sabba-vāri-vārito* in close proximity, we should take *vāri* as coming from the same root as *vārita*, and therefore having the same meaning as *vāraṇa*.

I therefore take the first compound to mean ‘restrained by all restraints’; the second to mean ‘fastened (or yoked) by (or to) all restraints’; I take the correct form of the fourth to be *-phuṭṭho*, which is the past participle of the verb *phasseti*, used of causing something unpleasant to impinge upon oneself.<sup>69</sup> The translation is therefore ‘subjected to all restraints’. In the third compound *dhuta* usually means ‘shaken off’, which is why the commentary explains it as ‘having evil shaken off by the restraint of evil’, but the analysis of the compound, with *-dhuta* at the end, is not easy. It may be that *dhuta* is here a variant of *dhota* ‘washed clean by the restraints’, which is how Nāṇamoli seems to be taking it. We might also think of a derivation from *dhṛta* ‘supported by all the restraints’. These last two explanations both involve taking *dhuta* in ways not quoted in PED. We might perhaps think that *dhuta* is a mistake for *vuta*, for other examples of the alternation *dh/v* can be quoted.<sup>70</sup> If this is the explanation, then we must note that the mistake is older than Buddhaghosa, who was clearly reading *dhuta*.

The existence of the word *vāri* in the required sense is supported by the phrase *savva-vārihiṃ vārie* at Isibhāsiyāim 29.19, for which Schubring gives ‘Absonderung’ as the meaning in his first German translation,<sup>71</sup> and ‘segregation’ in the English translation,<sup>72</sup> but ‘von allen Pforten’ in the second German translation,<sup>73</sup> taking *vārihiṃ* as the equivalent of *vārehim* < *dvāra*. In a set of slips sent by Bollée for the second edition of PED it is suggested that each compound should be changed to *sabba-vāre vārito*, etc., and translated as ‘restrained (*vārita*), liberating oneself (*dhuta*), bound up in (*phuṭa/phuṭṭha*) and engaged (*yuta*) in a general restraint (or act of restraining)’. It may well be that this is the correct way to translate the compounds, but I do not see any need to change the readings. Rather than change both Pāli and Prakrit *vāri* to *vāra* (assuming a coincidental error or corruption in both traditions?), it seems better to retain the

reading *vāri*. If this can be taken in the sense of *vāra* (not in PED) = *vāraṇa*, then each compound can, as it stands, be translated in the required way.

#### 9. *vuñhi* 'fire'

This word occurs four times in Pañca-g.<sup>74</sup> PED states that it must be meant for *v-unha* and *v' unghena*, and refers the reader to *unha* (< Skt *uṣṇa*). Elsewhere in this journal, however, Mrs Hazlewood very rightly points out<sup>75</sup> the connection with Skt *vahni* 'fire'. With the metathesis of *-h-* and *-n-*, and the common Prakrit retroflexion of *-n- > -ṇ-*, the word occurs in Prakrit in the form *vanhi*.<sup>76</sup> The Pāli form shows the further development of the labialisation of *-a- > -u-* after *-v-*.<sup>77</sup> We can therefore deduce that in all probability the word was borrowed into Pāli from a Prakrit where the retroflexion of *-n-* took place.

#### 10. *santhana* 'loosening, untying'

PED states that this word is to be derived from the root *śam-*, and compares Skt *śāntvana*. Mrs Margaret Cone<sup>78</sup> has drawn my attention to the fact that the equivalent verse in Nakatani's unpublished edition<sup>79</sup> of the Udāna-v (137) has *śra(n)thana*, which makes it clear that the Pāli word is to be derived from Skt (lex.) *śranthana*, from the root *śranth-* 'to loosen'. Mrs Cone also points out that the various versions of the verse found at Dhp 275 have a variety of synonyms for the compound *salla-santhana*. The Patna Dharmapada (359)<sup>80</sup> has *-sraṃsana* (cf. Skt *śalya-sraṃsana*);<sup>81</sup> Bernhard's edition<sup>82</sup> of Udāna-v (12.9–10) has *kṛntana*. This reading, in the Pāli form *kantana*, is found in the Be of Dhp and Dhp-a, where the gloss is: *salla-santhanan* (Be *-kantanan*) *ti rāga-sallādīnaṃ santhanaṃ* (Be *kantanaṃ*) *nimmanthanam abbāhanam* (Dhp-a III 404,2–4). It is interesting to note that it is Be which agrees with the BHS version, which raises questions, not easily answered, about the precise relationship between the various Buddhist literary traditions.

The word *santhana* also occurs at Vv 18.6, where we find: *kāmaṃ bhijjatu yaṃ kāyo n' eva atth' ettha santhanam*. PED gives the meaning 'satisfaction' for this context. The passage

is glossed as: *n' eva atthi me viriyassa santhanam sītala-karaṇam* in Ee (Vv-a 95,11), but with *sithili-karaṇam* in Be and Ce. It is clear that the meaning here too is 'slackening'.

#### 11. *sothāna* 'safety'

For this word PED compares Skt *svastyayana*, and states that at Ja IV 75,8\* and V 29,2\*–3\* the metre requires *sothayanam*. This is not strictly true, since in all three occurrences we are dealing with a long syllable appearing in place of the expected short sixth and seventh syllables in a Triṣṭubh pāda. This variation is found elsewhere.<sup>83</sup> It is, however, noteworthy that *sothāna* is to be derived from *sothayana*, with the contraction of *-aya- > -ā-*, as Lüders pointed out,<sup>84</sup> in place of the more usual *-e-*.<sup>85</sup> This development was regarded by Alsdorf as being an Eastern characteristic.<sup>86</sup>

It is also noteworthy that in *sothāna* we have the development of the consonant group *-sty- > -tth-*, and not *> -cch-*, as would be expected. The expected development is found in Patna Dharmapada *sacchayana* (370), where *sva-* has developed to *sa-*, whereas in Pāli it has developed to *so-*. This is possibly because of a samprasāraṇa form *su-* replacing *sva-*,<sup>86</sup> but it is more likely that *-v-* labialised the following *-a- > -u-*<sup>87</sup> before it was assimilated to the preceding *s-*. In either case the resultant *-u-* was written as *-o-* (pronounced as *-ō-*) before the geminate consonant.

It is possible that the *-cch-/tth-* alternation is simply scribal,<sup>88</sup> but there are examples which lead us to believe that the assimilation of a dental consonant + *-y-* to a geminate dental group rather than to a palatal consonant group was probably a dialect feature.<sup>89</sup>

CAMBRIDGE

K. R. NORMAN

#### Notes

1 See K.R. Norman, 'Pāli Lexicographical Studies III', in *JPTS* 1985, pp. 23–36.

2 Abbreviations are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli*

- Dictionary, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD). In addition: BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Skt; Skt = Sanskrit; MIA = Middle Indo-Aryan; PTC = Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance; Be = Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition; Ce = Simon Hewavitarne Bequest edition, unless otherwise stated; Ee = PTS edition; CDIAL = Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages.
- 3 H. Lüders, 'Das Würfelspiel im alten Indien', in *Philologica Indica*, Göttingen 1940, pp. 106–75.
- 4 Ee so (v.1. vihiyyati); Be vihiyyati; Ce as Ee; Se vihiyate. The commentary explains it as *parihāyati* (357,14'). We should probably read *-hiyy- or hiy-*.
- 5 *The Jātaka* Vol. II, translated by W.H.D. Rouse, Cambridge 1895, p. 245.
- 6 K.R. Norman, *The Group of Discourses*, London 1984, p. 118.
- 7 *tassa pāpamittassa ajjhābhavan, tena abhibhavitabbam attano lābhaya-sajivitaṃ, yathā naṃ so na ajjhābhavati tathā paṭhamataram eva attano akkhī viya paṇḍito puriso rakkheyya* (357,14'–17'): 'Your wealth, fame and livelihood which are to be overcome by him, first protect as a wise man his own eyes, so that he may not overcome (them)'.
- 8 Lüders, *op. cit.* (in n. 3), p. 146: 'so kann auch . . . abhibhū nur der kali sein; . . . abhibhū sicherlich den kali bezeichnet; . . . sind also kali, abhibhū, akṣarāja und nardita Synonyma'.
- 9 Elsewhere we read of the gambler 'hiding' the losing throw, rather than 'warding it off': *attano pana chādeti kaliṃ va kitavā saṭho* (Dhp 252).
- 10 See H. Smith, Sadd p. 1172: 'on notera que la rubrique . . . s'est adaptée aux mesures qui l'entourent' (8.9.2).
- 11 Sn p. 183 n. 10.
- 12 Despite this, Be reads *anugīyanti*, although it mentions the v.1. *anukiriyanti*.
- 13 *krubbati krubbantī ti ādini ca grīyati grīyanti ti ādini ca padāni Māgadhiā bhāsā eva: 'tapo idha krubbati; tatthā sikkhā na grīyanti' ti pāḍassanato* (Sadd 923,20–23).
- 14 O. von Hinüber, *Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma*, NAWG 1983, Nr. 3, Göttingen 1983, p. 72.
- 15 *ibid.*, pp. 72–73.
- 16 Nidd I 420,12. It is not strictly true to say that the reading of the Sinhalese MS is *anagriyanti*. It is rather *sikkhānagriyanti*, with some doubt about the word division.
- 17 von Hinüber, *op. cit.* (in n.14), p. 72.
- 18 This is the only example of the passive quoted in either CPD or PTC.
- 19 Nidd I 420,15.
- 20 J. Brough, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London 1962, p. 250 (*ad v.* 241).
- 21 *ibid.*, p. 251.
- 22 H. Lüders, *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons*, Berlin 1954, §§ 151–58.
- 23 *ibid.*, §§ 149–50, although Turner (CDIAL § 13080) gives a different

etymology for *sagghasi*, while *jagghati* may represent a dialect development of *-kṣ- > -ggh-* (cf. Skt *jajjhat-* 'laughing', showing the development of *-kṣ- > -jjh-*).

- 24 Brough, *op. cit.* (in n. 20), p. 251.
- 25 MW, p. 47, s.v. *anv-i*.
- 26 MW, p. 39, s.v. *anu-vī*.
- 27 Cf. the suggestion that *upagate* in the Maski version of Aśoka's Minor Rock Edict I is due to a comparable 'restoration' of a consonant for a glide *-y-* (K.R. Norman, 'Some aspects of the phonology of the Prakrit underlying the Aśokan inscriptions', in *BSOAS XXXIII*, 1970, p. 137).
- 28 Intervocalic *-t-* is unlikely to survive in Ardha-Māgadhi, and probably represents a scribal 'restoration'. The writing of inorganic *-t-* in this way is common in the Jain scribal tradition.
- 29 See Pandit H.D.T. Sheth, *Pāiasaddamahāṇavo*, Calcutta 1928, s.v. *aṇuvū* etc.
- 30 W. Schubring, *Ācārāṅga-sūtra*, Leipzig 1910, Index s.v. 2 ci.
- 31 R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-sprachen*, Strassburg 1900, § 593.
- 32 J. Brough, *The early Brahmanical system of gotra and pravara*, Cambridge 1953, p. 6.
- 33 D. Seyfort Ruegg, 'Pāli gottā/gotra and the term gotrabhū in Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit', in L. Cousins et al. (ed.): *Buddhist Studies in honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht 1974, pp. 199–210.
- 34 O. von Hinüber, 'Gotrabhū: Die sprachliche Vergeschichte eines philosophischen Terminus', in *ZDMG* 128, 1978, pp. 326–32.
- 35 O.H. de A. Wijesekera, 'The etymology of Pāli Gotrabhū', in A.K. Narain: *Studies in Pāli and Buddhism*, Delhi 1979, pp. 381–82.
- 36 von Hinüber, *op. cit.* (in n. 34), p. 331.
- 37 Wijesekera, *op. cit.* (in n. 35), p. 382.
- 38 See Baburam Saksena, 'Pāli bhūnahu', in *BSOS* VIII, 1936, pp. 713–14.
- 39 See Ja V 153 n. 3 *ad* 153,2\*.
- 40 D. Seyfort Ruegg, 'A further note on Pāli gotrabhū', in *JPTS* 1981, pp. 175–77.
- 41 Ruegg, *op. cit.* (in n. 33), p. 204.
- 42 von Hinüber, *op. cit.* (in n. 34), p. 331 n. 16.
- 43 *ibid.*, p. 331 n. 19.
- 44 Ruegg, *op. cit.* (in n. 33), pp. 206–7.
- 45 CPD Vol. II, p. 27 s.vv. *ā-gotrabhūṃ, ā-gotrabhūto*.
- 46 See Sadd, Index p. 1594 s.v. *pāṇa*.
- 47 von Hinüber, *op. cit.* (in n. 34), p. 331 n. 16.
- 48 L. Alsdorf, *Die Āryā-Strophen des Pāli-Kanons*, Mainz 1968, p. 252 [10] prefers the former name, while A.K. Warder, *Pāli Metre*, London 1967, p. 139 prefers the latter.
- 49 Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series, Ceylon 1960.
- 50 Ed. A.P. Buddhaddatta, Colombo 1930.
- 51 See K.R. Norman, 'Pāli and the language of the heretics', in *AO* 37 (1976), pp. 121–24.



- 52 The reading *rataññū* at D II 77,8 must be a misprint in Ee; the other editions read *ratt-*.
- 53 See E. Waldschmidt, *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, Teil II, Berlin 1951, p. 122, § 2.10.
- 54 See C. Caillat, *Pour une nouvelle grammaire du pāli*, Turin 1970, p. 15, referring to W. Schubring, *Die Lehre der Jainas*, Berlin and Leipzig 1935, p. 159 n. 3.
- 55 See Ratnachandraji, *An illustrated Ardha-Māgadhī Dictionary*, Vol. IV. s.v. *rāñia*.
- 56 See Sheth, *op. cit.* (in n. 29), s.v. *rāñia*.
- 57 'The young monk should ask forgiveness of the superior, and the superior of the young monk': *sehe rāñiyaṃ khāmijjā. rāñie vi sehaṃ khāmijjā* (Kalpasūtra, Sāmācārī § 59).
- 58 H. Jacobi, *The Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu*, Leipzig 1879, Glossary s.v. *rāñiya*.
- 59 See K.R. Norman, 'The palatalisation of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan', *JOI* (Baroda), Vol. XXV, pp. 328–42.
- 60 PED wrongly refers it to Skt *vadāniya*.
- 61 It is interesting to note that of all the versions of the teachings of the six heretics known to us, only the Pāli version mentions the four restraints. See G. MacQueen, 'The doctrines of the six heretics according to the Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra', in *III* 27 (1984), p. 296.
- 62 T.W. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Vol. I, London 1910, p. 74.
- 63 I.B. Horner, *Middle Length Sayings*, Vol. II, London 1957, pp. 41–42.
- 64 A.L. Basham, *History and Doctrines of the Ājivikas*, London 1951, p. 16.
- 65 See R.O. Franke, *Dīghanikāya*, Göttingen 1913, p. 61 n. 3.
- 66 Mrs C.A.F. Rhys Davids, *Kindred Sayings*, Vol. I, London 1917, p. 91 n. 1. What she calls there the substitution of precepts by the Buddha represents, in fact, the standard Jain usage.
- 67 In *Kshetresā Chandra Chattopadhyaya Felicitation Volume*, Allahabad 1972, which was reviewed by M.A. Mehendale in *IL* 34 (1973), p. 316. I regret that I have not personally seen the volume.
- 68 Ven. Nyanamoli Thera, *A Treasury of the Buddha's Discourses from the Majjhima-nikaya*, Vol. I, Bangkok n.d., p. 101.
- 69 See K.R. Norman, 'Middle Indo-Aryan Studies III' in *JOI* (Baroda) XI, p. 325.
- 70 See K.R. Norman, *Elders' Verses* II, London 1971, p. 57 (*ad v. 7*).
- 71 W. Schubring, *Isibhāsiyāim*, NAWG 1942, Nr. 6, Göttingen 1942, p. 567.
- 72 W. Schubring, *Isibhāsiyāim*, Ahmedabad 1974, p. 115.
- 73 W. Schubring, *Isibhāsiyāim*, Hamburg 1969, p. 31.
- 74 Pañca-g 13 15 19 35.
- 75 See pp. 131 foll.
- 76 See Sheth, *op. cit.* (in n. 29), s.v. *vañhi*.
- 77 See K.R. Norman, 'The labialisation of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan', *SII* Vol. II, pp. 41–58.

- 78 Mrs Cone is Research Assistant in Pāli Lexicography in the Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Cambridge.
- 79 Made available to Mrs Cone through the kindness of Prof. G. Fussman, of the College de France.
- 80 The verse is numbered 360 in the edition by G. Roth, in H. Bechert (ed.): *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen 1980, but 359 in the edition by N.S. Shukla, Patna 1979, where the second part of the compound is read as *-mumsano*.
- 81 See MW, p. 1059, s.v. *śalya-*.
- 82 F. Bernhard, *Udānavarga*, Göttingen 1965.
- 83 See W. Schubring, *op. cit.* (in n. 30), p. 54.
- 84 H. Lüders, *Philologica Indica*, Göttingen 1940, p. 283 n. 3.
- 85 See W. Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*, Strassburg 1916, § 27, where examples of the change *-āya- > -ā-* are also given, including the case ending *-āya*. It is possible that this change has concealed the occurrence of a genuine dative form in *vāñijā* at Ja IV 352,8\*, glossed *vāñijakassa* (353,6').
- 86 '... die korrekte Ostform (mit ... Kontraktion von *āya* zu *ā*): L. Alsdorf, 'Bemerkungen zum Vessantara-Jātaka', in *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden 1974, p. 292.
- 86 See K.R. Norman, 'Samprasāraṇa in Middle Indo-Aryan', in *JRAS* 1958, pp. 44–50.
- 87 See Norman, *op. cit.* (in n. 77), pp. 47–48.
- 88 See R. Pischel, *The Deśināmamālā of Hemachandra*, Bombay (second edition) 1938, p. 28, and H.C. Bhayani, *Studies in Hemachandra's Deśināmamālā*, Varanasi 1966, p. 16.
- 89 See K.R. Norman, 'The role of Pāli in early Sinhalese Buddhism', in H. Bechert (ed.): *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*, Göttingen 1978, p. 32, and 'The pratyeka-buddha in Buddhism and Jainism', in P. Denwood and A. Piatigorsky (ed.): *Buddhist Studies*, London 1983, p. 95.